

IN THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 5 and 6. These sheets, which include Figs. 5 and 6, replace the original sheets including Figs. 5 and 6. Replacement Fig. 5 now includes element reference indicators 500_k and S_k , and changes previous reference indicator "510₁" to --540₁--. Replacement Fig. 6 changes previous reference indication "680_k" to --680₁--.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 19-35 are pending in this application. Claim 36 is canceled by the present response without prejudice.

The disclosure was objected to for informalities. The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.84(p)(5). The drawings were objected under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claim 36 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 23-26, 28-31, and 33-35 were objected to for informalities. Claim 25 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 19-22, 27, and 32 are allowed. Claims 23-24, 26, 28-31, and 33-35 were noted as allowable if amended to overcome the noted objections. Claim 25 was noted as allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

Initially, applicants gratefully acknowledge the indication of the allowable subject matter in each of Claims 19-35.

Addressing first the noted objections to the disclosure in paragraph 1 of the Office Action, replacement Figure 5 is amended and now includes the reference indicator "S_k".

Further, the specification is amended by the present response at page 15, line 7 to now recite the phrase "output of the precursor module (1005) and the result is provided as an input to", as suggested in paragraph 1 of the Office Action.

Further, applicants submit the description of Fig. 9b is sufficient as that figure shows an equivalent fashion of the device of Fig. 9a, as noted in the present specification at page 14, line 26 et. seq.

With respect to the objection to the disclosure at page 12, line 26, that disclosure is believed to be proper. The disclosure at page 12, line 26 was objected to as certain features were not shown in Figure 6. However, applicants note that at page 12, line 26 applicants are

not referring to features shown in Figure 6 but instead to features of Figure 7. The beginning paragraph at page 12, line 23 starts "Unlike Fig. 6...". Thus, the noted disclosure is not directed to anything intended to be shown in Figure 6 and thus is believed to be proper.

Addressing now the objection to the drawings noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, those objections are traversed by the present response.

First, applicants note reference indicator 500_k is now added to the replacement Fig. 5. Further, the references to 860_k and 850_k are now deleted from the specification.

With respect to the reference indicator 861_k, that reference indicator is shown at the bottom of Figure 8 in a box labeled as a "Modulator".

Further, the reference indicator 1060 is also now deleted in the specification.

The above-noted amendments and comments are believed to address the objections to the drawings noted in paragraph 4 of the Office Action.

Addressing now the objection to the drawings noted in paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the specification is amended by the present response to now include the reference indicator 800_k, which is believed to address that noted objection.

Addressing now the objections to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) noted in paragraph 6 of the Office Action, the drawings are believed to properly show each of the claimed features.

The drawings do not explicitly show a flowchart corresponding to the claimed method, but that is not believed to be required. The drawings clearly show how the different claimed sequences are executed. In claim 19 the "(a) estimating..." is for example shown in elements 530_i, 530_p in Figure 5 in the present specification, and is also disclosed in the present specification at page 9, line 14 *et seq.* Further, the "(b) estimating..." of claim 19 is shown for example in elements 610_i through 640_i in Figure 6 in the present specification, and is also disclosed in the present specification for example at page 10, line 32 to page 11, line 8.

Further, the “(c) estimating...” of claim 19 is also shown in the drawings at elements 650₁ through 670₁ in Figure 6, and is also noted in the specification at page 11, lines 9-22.

Further, the “(d) subtracting...” of claim 19 is shown for example in element 680₁ in Figure 6 in the present specification and is noted in the present specification at page 11, line 23 *et seq.*

Thus, how each sequence in claim 19 is executed is believed to be clearly shown in the drawings. Thus, the drawings are believed to be in full compliance with all requirements under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a).

Further, the other noted objections to the drawings are corrected by the present response as replacement Figure 5 now properly labels element 540₁ and replacement Figure 6 properly labels element 680₁.

Addressing now the rejection of claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, that rejection is obviated by the present response as claim 36 is canceled by the present response without prejudice.

Addressing now the claim objections, claims 23, 24, and 26 are amended to address the objections thereto.

With respect to the inquiry as to the meaning of the term “channel formation” in claim 28, first that claim language is now clarified in claim 28. Applicants also drawn attention to the specification at page 10, lines 5-15 where the operation of channel formation by the channel former 520_p is described. Thus, claim 28 is believed to be clear with respect to such features, particularly in view of the specification.

Claims 29 and 30 are also amended as suggested in paragraph 9 of the Office Action.

With respect to the question in claim 33 as to the meaning of the limitation “iteration of a set of sequences”, applicants first note that language is now clarified to recite “an iteration of a set of the sequences”, to now clearly indicate that such an iteration is directed to

the sequences recited in claim 19. Further, the term "an iteration" merely indicates that certain of the sequences can be repeated. Thus, claim 33 is believed to be clear.

With respect to claim 35, claim 35 is amended suggested in the Office Action, and applicants also draw attention to the specification at page 10, lines 5-15 with respect to the term "channel formation".

Addressing now the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, claim 25 is amended by the present response to now refer to "estimated data transmitted by the users", which is believed to be fully supported by claim 19 at the "(b) estimating the data transmitted by the user...". The amendment to claim 25 is believed to address the rejection thereto under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

The present response is believed to address all of the outstanding issues in the present application, and each of the currently pending claims was indicated as reciting allowable subject matter. Therefore, in view of the present response the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\211929US-AM.DOC

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423